



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

*The Hebrew Metheg*<sup>1</sup>.—By FRANK R. BLAKE, Ph. D.,  
Johns Hopkins University.

The Traditional View.

THE traditional views of the Jewish grammarians on the sign Metheg are ably set forth by Baer in his article on "Die Methegsetzung".<sup>2</sup> In this article, which forms the basis of the treatment of this subject in modern Hebrew Grammars, Baer states that when any sound that does not bear the primary tone is to be emphasized, a Metheg is affixed to the sign for that sound, the Metheg, conformably with its name (bridle), indicating that the sign to which it is attached is to be dwelt upon and not hastened over in pronunciation. He divides the various Methegs into three classes, light, heavy, and euphonic, with a number of subdivisions. His scheme is in outline as follows.

I. The light Metheg (מתג קל).

- A. The ordinary Metheg (פשוט) indicating the secondary tone, in the first open syllable two or more places from the primary tone, as, e. g., in הָאֲדָמָה (Gen. 1, 27).
- B. The indispensable Metheg (תמוך).
  - a) with long vowel before Shewa, e. g., הִיְתָה (Gen. 1, 2).
  - b) with long vowel before Maqqeph, e. g., שֶׁתִּלִּי (Gen. 4, 25).
  - c) with Sere in Nasog Ahor, e. g., אֶהָב (Prov. 12, 1).
  - d) with a vowel before a Hateph, e. g., גַּעֲשֶׂה (Gen. 1, 26).

---

<sup>1</sup> In the following article the primary accent or tone of Hebrew words will be marked by the sign —, e. g., הָאֲדָמָה, unless there is some special reason for employing the proper accent marks. In the application of Metheg, two or more words connected by Maqqeph are treated as if they formed one word.

<sup>2</sup> S. Baer, *Die Methegsetzung nach ihren überlieferten Gesetzen dargestellt*, in Merx's *Archiv für wissenschaftliche Erforschung des alten Testaments*, Bd. 1, Halle 1869, pp. 55—67 and 194—207.

- e) with the vowel before the initial consonant of הִיָּה, חִיָּה, e. g., יְהִיָּה (Gen. 1, 29).
- f) in the forms of the plural of בֵּית, e. g., בְּתִים, and in אֲנִיָּה.

## II. The heavy Metheg (מתג כבד).

### A. with vowels.

- a) with the vowel of the article before a consonant with Shewa and without Dagesh, e. g., הַמִּכְסֶּה (Lev. 3, 3).
- b) with the Pathah of ה interrogative, e. g., הַאֵלֶּךְ,<sup>1</sup> (Ex. 2, 7).
- c) in certain forms with a short vowel (including Pathah, Segol, short Hireq, and short Shureq) three places before the primary tone, provided this is marked with a disjunctive accent, e. g., וַיִּשְׁמְעוּ (Gen. 3, 8).
- d) in the second closed syllable before the tone with the vowels Segol, short Hireq or short Shureq<sup>2</sup>, when the first syllable before the tone contains Pathah or Segol, and the tone is marked by a disjunctive accent, e. g., הַמֶּתֶהֱפֹכֶת (Gen. 3, 24).
- e) with the first syllable of imperfects with Qames Hattuph before Maqqeph, e. g., יִשְׁמְרֵצֶאתָךְ (Ps. 121, 8).
- f) with the Pathah of the forms וַיִּרְעֶזְכֶּם, וַיִּרְעֶזְךָ with disjunctive accent,
- g) with the Pathah of וַיְהִי and וַיְהִי before Maqqeph and when accented with Pashta.
- h) with the vowel of the initial syllable of a number of miscellaneous forms, accented for the most part with Zarka.

### B. with Shewa in the initial syllable.

#### 1.—in the metrical books.

- a) with a Shewa three places before the tone, when the word is marked by a disjunctive accent without preceding conjunctive, instead of on the following open syllable, e. g., נִסְתַּעֲלִינוּ (Ps. 4, 7).
- b) with the Shewa of the divine names אֲדֹנִי (יהוה) and

<sup>1</sup> The Metheg with ה interrogative is regularly placed to the right of the vowel to distinguish the ה from the article, except in the poetical books: cf. Baer, *op. cit.*, p. 196, ft. nt. 1.

<sup>2</sup> That Pathah is not entirely excluded is shown by הַנְּחִילִי (Hos. 4, 17). For the second Metheg cf. III, A. a.

אלהים when they are accented with great Rebia without preceding conjunctive accent, e. g., אֱלֹהִים<sup>1</sup> (Ps. 25, 2).

c) with the Shewa of a word accented with Oleveyored, Great Rebia, or Dehi, without preceding conjunctive accent, provided at least one vowel intervenes, and this has not already Metheg, e. g., וְהָיָה (Ps. 1, 3).

d) with אֲנִי when accented with Munah as conjunctive accent before Dehi.

2.—in the other books of the Bible

a) with the Shewa of words accented with Gershaim or Pazer without preceding conjunctive accent, when at least two vowels lie between Shewa and tone syllable, and the first has not already Metheg, e. g., וְאֶת־פְּתָרָיו (Gen. 10, 14).

b) with the Shewa of words accented with Darga as second conjunctive accent before Rebia, with Kadma as second conjunctive accent before Pashta or Tebir, or with Munah as third conjunctive before Telisha, provided that at least one vowel lies between Shewa and the tone syllable, and that this vowel has not already Metheg, e. g., שְׁלָמִים (Gen. 34, 21).

### III. The Euphonic Metheg (נְעִיָא לְתַקֵּן הַקְרִיָאָה).

A. at the end of a word.

a) with a final ע preceded by Pathah in a word accented on the penult, when this word is connected by a conjunctive accent with a word accented on the first syllable, e. g., וַיִּשָּׁבַע לוֹ (Gen. 24, 9).

b) with a final guttural consonant of a word closely connected by Maqqeph or conjunctive accent with a word beginning with a guttural, e. g., נָבִיעַ הַכֶּסֶף (Gen. 44, 2).

B. at the beginning of a word.

a) in the closed initial syllable of certain dissyllabic words, e. g., קָדְפִי (Ps. 71, 11).

This classification is of course entitled to respect as representing the views of the native Jewish grammarians, but it must be remembered that they were not the same men who

---

<sup>1</sup> When Metheg is affixed to a composite Shewa it is placed between Shewa and vowel as here, cf. Baer, *op. cit.*, p. 202, ft. nt.

invented the pointing, but later commentators on this pointing. They represent what they thought was the meaning of the various points at their time, basing their conclusions in all probability not only on tradition, but also on their own individual opinions<sup>1</sup>. The body of rules for Metheg was a gradual growth, compiled from various sources. This is indicated by the variation of the manuscripts in its use, and by the fact that in the best and oldest manuscripts some of its most prominent uses are practically unknown, e. g., the use of Metheg before a Hataeph (I. B. *d*)<sup>2</sup>. There is no reason, therefore, why the traditional view should be accepted simply because it is traditional, its acceptance or rejection will depend largely on its ability to explain the actual phenomena.

As a matter of fact the traditional classification of the uses of Metheg is not satisfactory. While there is a certain amount of justification for it in general, many of the details are not properly worked out and assimilated to the general scheme (cf. e. g., II. A. *h*, III. B. *a*). We find uses separated that belong together, and those which are quite different placed under the same heading. For example the Metheg in such forms as וַיִּתְּנָא and that in those like וַיִּתְּעַצב are placed in different sub-classes of the heavy Metheg (viz., A, *c*, and A, *d*), though they evidently belong together. On the other hand the Metheg in the forms of the verbs הִיהָ and חִיהָ, e. g., וַיִּהְיֶה, is placed under the same general heading as the Metheg in forms like וַיַּעֲשֶׂה (viz. light Metheg B. *d* and B. *e*), though they are used to denote two entirely different things. Moreover the connection between the various kinds of Metheg is not made sufficiently clear, nor is the general principle underlying the use of the Metheg in all cases adequately emphasized. A more accurate and scientific classification of the various uses of Metheg is certainly to be desired.

### The underlying Principle.

The general principle which underlies all the uses of Metheg, according to the traditional explanation, is that of emphasis, but the emphasis is certainly not always an actual emphasis,

<sup>1</sup> Cf. C. D. Ginsburg, *Introd. to the Massoretico-Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible*, London, 1897, pp. 462—465: B. Stade, *Lehrbuch der Hebr. Grammatik*, Leipzig, 1879, p. 54, § 50.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Ginsburg, *op. cit.*, pp. 469—778 *passim*.

as is indicated by Baer's statement<sup>1</sup>, cf. I. B. *b*. The fundamental use of Metheg seems to have been, not necessarily to emphasize, but to call special attention to; it was thus a sort of *nota bene*. The fact that the majority of the syllables marked with Metheg bore the secondary tone led to the idea that emphasis or lingering on the sound in question was the underlying signification of the sign.

Considering this faculty of calling special attention to, to be fundamental, the chief uses of Metheg may be classed under three heads. It may be employed to call special attention to—

- a) a consonant,
- b) a vowel,
- c) an accent, or accented syllable.

#### **Metheg used to call attention to a Consonant.**

This Metheg corresponds to Baer's III. A. *a* and *b*. In both these cases the Metheg is placed under a final guttural to call special attention to it in positions where it would be likely to be slurred over.

#### **Metheg used to call attention to a Vowel.**

This Metheg calls special attention to a vowel which is likely to be mispronounced in the form in question, or which is irregular or out of place in the form. The vowel which is thus marked may be long or short.

This Metheg is employed with a long vowel in the following cases, viz.:

- (1) It is used with a long final vowel in a closed syllable before Maqqeph, e. g., שְׁתִּלִּי (Gen. 4, 25), עֵץ־הֵן (Gen. 2, 16): in the first case without Metheg the reading would naturally be *sōth-lî*, while before Maqqeph a Sere regularly becomes Segol; cases like שְׁמִינָא (Gen. 47, 29) and בְּתוֹךְ הֵן (Gen. 3, 3), where there is no danger of a mistake without Metheg, have followed the analogy of the first two cases, the point of contact being that both sets of cases end in long vowels.
- (2) It is used with Sere which is to be retained in Nasog Ahor, e. g., אֶהָבָה דָּעַת (Prov. 12, 1); without Metheg the reading would naturally be אֶהָבָה.

---

<sup>1</sup> *op. cit.*, p. 56, § 1.

(3) It is used with a long vowel before Shewa, the Shewa being silent as in גִּרְשׁוֹן (Gen. 46, 11), בְּלִשְׁאֲצֹר (Dan. 5, 12), or vocal, as in הִיְתָה (Gen. 1, 2), יָדָה (Gen. 22, 12), יִדְעִי (Gen. 3, 5). Here originally as in (1) the Metheg was used to prevent an improper pronunciation, e. g., גִּרְשׁוֹן or *ĩd̥d̥xa*; cases like יִדְעִי are due to an extension of the principle to all long vowels. In cases in which the Shewa is vocal, as it probably is in הִיְתָה, יָדָה, &c.<sup>1</sup>, the Metheg stands in the syllable which bears the secondary tone, and so came to be regarded as the sign of this tone. It is not impossible that the use of Metheg as an accentual sign originated with cases like these.

(4) It is used in the forms of בָּתִּים and in אֲנִי to insure the pronunciation *bāttim*, *ānná* instead of *bōttim*, *ōnná*.

This Metheg is employed with a short vowel in the following cases, viz.:

(1) It is used in the forms of הִיה and חִיה to call special attention to the *i* vowel before ה and ח where we should expect Segol or Pathah, e. g., יִהְיֶה, יִחְיֶה, &c.; the Metheg in forms like אֲהִיה (Gen. 26, 3), וְהִיה (Gen. 12, 2), וְחִיה (Gen. 20, 7), is probably due to the analogy of the more numerous forms with Hireq.

(2)<sup>2</sup> It is used to call special attention to an *ö* vowel in a situation where it might be mistaken for *â*, e. g., אֲרִה־לִי (Nu. 23, 7), קָרָה־לִי (Nu. 22, 11, 17), קָרָשִׁים and שָׂרָשִׁים in numerous instances. Here the Qames of the first syllable would naturally have been read *â*, as it stands in an open syllable. The use of the Metheg with Qames Hataph was also extended to cases in which this vowel stood before Shewa. In certain imperative forms with *ö* in the first syllable Metheg was employed to call attention to the unusual vocalization, *ö* instead of the regular *i*, e. g., שִׁמְרָה (Ps. 86, 2). In certain infinitive and imperfect forms with suffix ה—, Metheg was used with Qames to call special attention to the fact that the regular *ö* (Holem) of the infinitive had been changed to *ö* (Qames

<sup>1</sup> Cf. F. E. König, *Historisch-kritisches Lebrg. der Hebr. Spr.*, Leipzig, 1881. 1<sup>te</sup> H., pp. 111—118.

<sup>2</sup> For a discussion of the pronunciation of the Qames in these forms cf. König, *op. cit.*, pp. 104—111.

Ĥatuph), e. g., לְמִשְׁחָה<sup>1</sup> (1 Sam. 15, 1), לְהִרְגָה (1 Sam. 24, 11), יִפְגֹּשֶׁה (Gen. 32, 18). The extension of this Metheg to the infinitive form בָּעֲבְרוּ (Jos. 4, 7) is apparently without special reason, as *ö* is the regular vowel in such forms; possibly it is due to formal analogy with the imperatives like שִׁמְרָה. The fact that Metheg was ordinarily employed to mark a long Qames before Shewa, would naturally lead to a confusion between *ö* and *a*, and this is doubtless the reason why the Metheg with *ö* is preserved only in exceptional cases. The Metheg with *ö* in forms like בָּעֲלָה, פָּעֲלָה does not belong here, but under the accentual Metheg (cf. below p. 85).

- (3) In the forms of the divine name אֲדֹנִי with prefixed particles, Metheg is used with the Pathah of the particle in all cases where the *a* is written without Ĥateph, to call attention to the fact that Pathah is the proper vowel here, and not Qames (*â*) even though the *a* has apparently quiesced, e. g., בְּאֲדֹנִי, לְאֲדֹנִי, וְאֲדֹנִי, &c.: so also with similar forms of יהוה, viz., בְּיְהוָה, לְיְהוָה, וְיְהוָה, &c., because they were read וְאֲדֹנִי, &c.
- (4) In the word אֲשֶׁרִי, a Metheg is employed after the Shewa to indicate that it is vocal, viz., אֲשֶׁרִי<sup>2</sup> (Ps. 1, 1), and elsewhere.

### Accentual Metheg.

The third and most common use of the Metheg is to call attention, not to the vowel itself to which it is affixed, but to the fact that the vowel bears a special stress. This use may have originated from the fact that in certain forms the Metheg marked a vowel which bore the secondary accent (cf. above pp. 83, 80). This use may be subdivided as follows.

#### I.

It is employed with a full vowel in the first open syllable two or more places before the tone to denote a secondary accent. This is Baer's so called ordinary Metheg (I. A.). Examples are הָאָדָם (Gen. 1, 27), הָאָדָמוֹנִי (Gen. 10, 18), מִהֶמְתַּחַתָּוֹת

<sup>1</sup> Baer-Delitzsch has לְמִשְׁחָה with Ĥateph Qames; this is an additional indication of the *o* quality of the preceding Qames.

<sup>2</sup> For the Metheg with Pathah cf. below p. 94.



(Ezek. 42, 5), בְּאֶצְמָהּ (Gen. 7, 1), קְבֵר־רָחֵל (Gen. 35, 20). The vowel of the open syllable is usually long as in the examples cited, but it may also be short as in מֶלֶךְ-צָר (2 Sam. 5, 11), נָחֵל (Jos. 14, 1).

This ordinary Metheg, however, includes a great deal more than Baer states. He enumerates cases like וַיְהִי־הוּא (Gen. 4, 8) and וַיֵּאָשֶׁךְ (Gen. 12, 2) under this head, but places cases like תַּעֲבֹד (Gen. 4, 12) and נֶאֱמָרוּ (Gen. 22, 13) under the so-called indispensable Metheg. This latter class of cases, and all cases in fact in which Metheg is employed with a vowel before a Hataeph such as e. g., הֶעֱשִׂירִי (Gen. 8, 5), צִחָקָה (Gen. 18, 13), וַיִּשְׁתָּר (Job. 17, 9), &c., are simply examples of forms with the ordinary Metheg. These forms are to be read, *tà-'a-bód, nè-'e-ház, hà-'a-sî-rî, çà-qa-qáh, û-to-hár*, &c.

In the case of forms beginning with copulative ו the usage varies. Many such forms are without Metheg under ו, as e. g., וּלְמִקְוֵה (Gen. 1, 10), וַיָּכֶמוּ (Gen. 19, 15), וַיִּשְׁפְּטֵי (Gen. 19, 30), וַיִּשְׁפָּחוּת (Gen. 12, 16), &c. Other forms again, particularly those with sibilants after the ו take the Metheg with ו, the following consonant having Hataeph Pathah, e. g., וַיִּזְרֹה (Gen. 2, 12), וַיִּשְׁרֹה (Lev. 25, 34), וַיִּשְׁמַע (Num. 23, 18), וַיִּקְרָב (Ps. 55, 22), וַיִּרְעַם (Ps. 28, 9), &c. In the first case the forms are probably meant to be read *ul-miq-ueh, ukh-mô, us-tê, us-fa-hóth*, the *u* being regarded as short, and forming one syllable with the following consonant; thus there is no open syllable two or more places before the tone to receive Metheg. In the second case the forms, as is shown still more clearly by the use of the Hataeph, are intended to be read *û-za-hav, û-sa-dhéh, û-qa-ráv, û-ra-ém*, the *u* being probably regarded as long, and forming by itself an open syllable, which being two places before the tone takes Metheg. The inconsistency in the use of Metheg with ו may be due to the fact that it was pronounced *ũ* by some and *û* by others, one tradition being preserved in one case, and the other in another, or it may be due to the fact the ו was pronounced *û* only before sibilants and certain other consonants.

Cases in which the vowel *a* of the article takes Metheg before a consonant with Shewa, and cases in which the *a* of the interrogative ה takes Metheg are also to be classed here, the Metheg in all these cases marking the secondary tone in the first open syllable with full vowel two or more places back from the tone. Such forms as הַמִּכְפֹּה (Lev. 3, 3), הֶלְלוּם (Lev.

25, 32), בְּצַפְרָדָּעִים (Ex. 7, 27), לְמִסְלָה (Jer. 31, 21), are to be read *hà-me-kas-séh*, *hà-le-ṣiṣ-ṣim*, *bà-ṣe-far-de-ʿim*, *lā-me-sil-láh*<sup>1</sup>; forms like הַמְכָסָה<sup>2</sup> (Gen. 18, 17), הַכּוֹזָה (Gen. 34, 31), הַזֶּלֶךְ (Ex. 2, 7), הַחֲנֹם (Job. 1, 9), are to be read *hà-me-kas-séh*, *hà-ke-zo-náh*, *hà-ʿe-lékh*, *hà-ḥin-nám*.

The Metheg is not used in the above cases when *yod* is the consonant immediately following the article or interrogative particle, e. g., הַיְלִים (Gen. 33, 5), הַיְדַעְתֶּם (Gen. 29, 5), &c.; nor in cases like הַמְעַט<sup>3</sup> (Nu. 35, 8), לְקָרֵב (Ps. 144, 1), הַאֲףִי (Gen. 18, 13), הַבְּעֹר (Job. 22, 13), where the tone is on the syllable immediately following; nor in cases where the syllable adjoining the article or interrogative particle has already what Baer calls the usual Metheg as, e. g., בְּאֵי-הַמִּשְׁנָע (2 Ki. 9, 11), הַאֲחִיָּם (Num. 32, 6)<sup>4</sup>. In the first of these exceptions the *yod* forms a diphthong with the preceding *a*, viz., *hai-la-dhím*, *hai-dha-tém*, so that we have what was regarded as a closed syllable two places or more before the tone, and hence no Metheg. In the second series of exceptions no Metheg is used because the *a* of ה stands immediately before the tone; forms in which ה precedes a consonant with Shewa are to be read as dissyllabic, viz., *ham-ʾát*, *laq-ráv*, *hav-ʾádh*, &c. In the third series of exceptions, the Metheg stands on the syllable which was preferred as the place of the secondary tone: in the first example *ham* probably forms a closed syllable, viz., *bà-ham-šu-gáʿ*; in the second, *ha* is only one place before the secondary tone<sup>5</sup>. In the case of ה interrogative, moreover, no Metheg is employed in those forms in which Daghesh is placed in the consonant following

<sup>1</sup> It is not impossible to regard the first syllable of forms with the article like הַמְכָסָה as having an initial closed syllable, viz. *ham-kas-seh*; and forms like הַמְעַט (Nu. 35, 8) in which the first syllable is certainly closed, viz. *ham-ʾat*, and hence without Metheg, might seem to point that way. The Metheg would then belong under the second subdivision of accentual Metheg (cf. below). The difficulty with this view, however, is that it offers no explanation of the absence of Metheg in forms like הַיְלִים.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. above p. 79, ft. nt. 1

<sup>3</sup> Written with Metheg, viz., הַמְעַט by Van der Hooght, 1705. This writing indicates the pronunciation *ha-me-ʾat*, the Metheg being the ordinary accentual Metheg.

<sup>4</sup> Van der Hooght has הַאֲחִיָּם with the second variety of accentual Metheg described below.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Baer *op. cit.* p. 58, § 7.

the ה. The *a* in these forms was of course regarded as standing in a closed syllable, hence no Metheg.

## II.

Metheg is employed in a number of cases in a closed syllable<sup>1</sup> with the vowels of the article, ו consecutive, the preposition *מן*, the reflexive prefix *הת*, with a vowel before a doubled consonant, and with the vowel of certain particles and constructs before Maqqeph; e. g., הַכְּנַעֲנִי (Gen. 10, 18), וַיִּשְׁמְעוּ (Gen. 3, 8), מִן־רָעָה (Gen. 17, 12), הַתִּינִיכִי (Ex. 14, 13), אֲשֶׁלֶּחָהּ (Gen. 32, 27), אֶל־כָּל־עֲדָת (Ex. 16, 9), מִן־אֲרֻצָּם (Deut. 11, 14), &c. According to Baer this Metheg is used only in the third syllable before the tone with the short vowels *a*, *i*, *e*, *u*<sup>2</sup> when the first syllable before the tone has Shewa, and the word in question has a disjunctive accent. It is true that this variety of Metheg is used chiefly under the above conditions, but it does not seem to be confined to them, e. g., מִן־הַשָּׂדֶה (Gen. 30, 16), מִכָּל־הַמְּקוֹמוֹת (Ezr. 1, 4), עַל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ (Ex. 29, 21), וַיִּתְעַצֵּב (Gen. 6, 6), הַתְּנַלְּלוּ (Job. 30, 14), &c.

This use of Metheg is probably due to the fact that a special stress fell on the vowel in each of these cases. That the article and ו conversive bore originally a strong stress is indicated by the doubling of the following consonant<sup>3</sup>. It is also quite natural for a special stress to fall on the heavy prefix *הת* and on the vowel before a doubling, and on the final syllable (i. e. the original tone syllable) of a construct. Why a special stress should fall on proclitic prepositions and particles, except in the case of *מן* which for the most part comes under the head of a vowel before a doubled consonant, the *nun* being regularly assimilated, is not entirely clear.

<sup>1</sup> Olshausen apparently regards this Metheg as accentual, cf. *Lehrbuch der Hebr. Sprache*, Braunschweig, 1861, p. 88, e, 1.

<sup>2</sup> According to Baer the vowel *ö*, Qames Hatuph, is not included here, because Qames with Metheg is ordinarily long Qames and confusion would therefore have resulted, e. g., כָּל־מַעֲנִיּוֹת (Gen. 7, 11) &c. All the examples given by Baer (*op. cit.*, p. 199, § 27) are cases in which the *ö* vowel is the vowel of כל. As it would be quite natural for the word meaning "all" to have a special stress, Baer's explanation of the regular absence of Metheg with this word is quite plausible.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. C. Brockelmann, *Grundriß der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen*, Berlin, 1908, Bd. 1, p. 107, v.

The fact that Metheg is not employed with the vowels in question in all cases would seem to indicate that they did not always bear a special stress. This stress was ordinarily preserved by tradition only in cases where the syllable in question was the only other syllable of special prominence in the word besides the tone syllable. No Metheg was employed when the accent of a word was a conjunctive accent, as in that case the secondary tone was not so prominent.

Whenever there is an open syllable two places from the tone in a word of the form prescribed above, it regularly takes the Metheg according to rule, but in this case the Metheg is also affixed to the preceding syllable, e. g., וַיַּעֲקֹר (Gen. 22, 9), וַיִּתְּפֹצְצֵנוּ (Hab. 3, 6), בְּצִהְרֵיָם (Gen. 43, 16), אֲשַׁלְחֶהָ (Gen. 32, 27), &c. The Metheg in the open syllable in these examples may be due to the fact that it has become a fixture with the vowel before a H̄ateph, and so was retained in spite of the fact that the secondary tone falls on another syllable, or it may be that we have here a combination of two conflicting traditions, one school of Massorites preferring to place the secondary accent on the emphatic closed syllable<sup>1</sup>, the other preferring the regular method of accenting the first open syllable two or more places back from the tone. When the H̄ateph stands under a consonant which is not identical with the one that follows, and the vowel that precedes the H̄ateph is H̄olem, no Metheg is employed in the syllable before H̄olem, e. g., הִשְׁאֲבֹתָ (Gen. 24, 11), וַיִּגְאֲלֵי (Neh. 7, 64), עַד-בְּאֵף (Gen. 19, 22). In this case there appears to have been no doubt as to the place for the secondary tone, the long vowel seeming to all the most emphatic element outside of the syllable with primary tone.

The forms with copulative ׀ which Baer includes here, e. g., וְלִרְעֶהָ (Gen. 13, 15), וַמְבַרְכֶּהָ (Gen. 27, 29), וַיִּשְׁכַּבְהָ (Deut. 6, 7), &c., are perhaps properly classed under this head, ׀ taking the secondary accent for the same reason as the preposition על; in this case the *u* is short, and the forms are to be read *ûl-zar-'a-ká*, *ûm-ba-ra-khé-kha*, *ûv-šokh-be-khá*, &c. It is also

---

<sup>1</sup> That the Metheg in the closed syllable is the more original of the two is indicated by the fact that Metheg before a H̄ateph is rarely used in the best manuscripts, while the other occurs in a number of cases. Cf. Ginsburg, *op. cit.* pp. 474, 675, 731.

possible, however, that the *u* is long, and that the Metheg marks the secondary tone in an open syllable, vix., *ù-le-zar-'a-khá*, *ù-me-bà-ra-khé-kha* (cf. below p. 92), *ù-ve-šokh-be-khá*, &c.; if this is so these forms belong under (I).

### III.

Metheg is employed in the first of two closed syllables connected by Maqqeph with a word accented on the first syllable, provided this accent is disjunctive, e. g., קָרַמְתָּֿעֶן (Gen. 4, 16), יִלְדִּי־בֵן (Gen. 4, 26), וַיִּפְצַר־בּוֹ (Gen. 33, 11), &c. The Metheg seems to indicate that the secondary tone, which would naturally fall on the syllable which is accented when the word is authotone, i. e. on the last syllable, has been retracted to the preceding syllable in order to prevent the secondary and primary accents from standing in adjoining syllables. Cases like הִבְרִילָהֿ (Gen. 31, 32), תִּקְחִילָהֿ (Gen. 7, 2), וַיִּתְּנִילָהֿ (Gen. 28, 4), &c. belong here; the secondary tone is retracted in spite of the syllable *le* before the primary tone, as is shown by the Segol for Sere. When the accent of the word after Maqqeph was a conjunctive accent, the secondary accent on the preceding word was not so prominent and so was not specially marked, e. g., הִתְהַלֵּךְ־נָח (Gen. 6, 9), נִשְׁמַת־רוּחַ (Gen. 7, 22), &c.

Those forms of the Hithpael which Baer includes here, e. g., הִתְהַפְּקֶתָּ (Gen. 3, 24), וַיִּתְּעַצֵּב (Gen. 6, 6), &c., really belong under the preceding heading; forms with ו copulative such as וַתִּכְסֶּנּוּ (Jer. 3, 25), וַסְתַּר־כּוֹשׁ (Is. 45, 14), &c. are perhaps best considered as belonging under (I), *u* being long and constituting an open syllable, viz., *ù-the-kas-sé-nu*, *ù-se-har-kúsh*.

Under this head are also to be classed the forms וַיְהִי־וַיְהִי before Maqqeph, e. g., וַיְהִי־אֹרֶךְ (Gen. 1, 3), וַיְהִי־בֹקֶר (Gen. 1, 5), וַיְהִי־יָרֵד (Gen. 5, 18).

Of a similar character, moreover, is the Metheg in the first syllable of an *o* imperfect followed by Maqqeph in which the *ō* has been shortened to *ö*, e. g., יִקְסַל־עֲנִי (Job. 24, 14), יִשְׁמַר־ (Ps. 121, 8). In all such cases the *ō* has lost the tone and the Metheg is employed to emphasize the fact that the secondary tone is on the first and not on the second syllable. In these forms, however, the Metheg is always employed without regard to the accentuation of the following word as it has come to be regarded as the regular sign of an imperfect with *ö* in the second syllable, on account of the contrast

with the Metheg in such forms as יִגְבַּל-אֹתוֹ (Jos. 18, 20), which calls special attention to the fact that the imperfect has an *ō* in spite of the Maqqeph.

#### IV.

Metheg is employed with a syllable containing Shewa in a variety of cases (cf. II. B. above page 79 f.) to indicate that some special stress falls on this syllable. The reason for the special accentuation of such syllables seems to be entirely a musical one, and as the musical value of the accents is lost, it is, of course, useless to speculate as to the exact value of the Metheg. All that can be said is that it denoted a special stressing of a usually unstressed syllable<sup>1</sup> in certain melodies.

#### Exceptional uses of Metheg.

The various uses of the Metheg enumerated above do not exhaust all the instances in which it is employed. There are a number of cases in which it is difficult to say what is the reason for the addition of the Metheg.

In the first place are to be noted the Methegs used in an initial closed syllable immediately before the tone syllable, e. g., עֲלֶן (Gen. 36, 23), הִשְׁחִיתוּ (Ps. 14, 1), רָדְפוּ (Ps. 71, 11), תִּבְחֶר (Ps. 65, 5), עֲרֹבֶת (Nu. 31, 12), הָרָכִי (Jer. 12, 16), לִשְׁכּוֹת (Ezek. 42, 13), &c. These Baer groups under the euphonic Metheg, but his explanation of their significance as a class is not satisfactory.

It is not impossible that in some cases the sign was used to call attention to a short vowel. This was perhaps the case in the Edomite proper names עֲלִיָּה, עֲלֶן (Gen. 36, 23; 40). Here some probably pronounced a long vowel in the first syllable as is indicated by the LXX equivalents of עֲלִיָּה, viz., Γωλων, Γωλωμ, Γωλαν: the Massorites on this supposition would have used the Metheg to call especial attention to the fact that they preferred the pronunciation with short vowel.

In some cases, whatever was the original meaning of the sign, some Massorites undoubtedly regarded the Metheg as indicating a secondary tone in a closed syllable, as is shown by

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Baer, *op. cit.*, p. 202, § 35; p. 203, § 37; p. 205, § 40, all near end of paragraph.

the fact that the following consonant is in some MSS. pointed with a Chateph, e. g., תְּבַחֲרֵם (Ps. 65, 5, Baer-Del.), תִּלְעַגְךָ (Prov. 30, 17, Baer-Del.).

The Metheg in forms like תְּרַבִּי is regarded by Baer as an additional sign of the absence of the Daghes in the initial consonant of the second syllable, which view is not impossible. The spirantic value of the third consonant, due to the vowel that originally stood before it, but which has been syncopated, would naturally lead to the idea that the preceding Shewa was vocal, and hence that the syllable before the Shewa was open. To indicate this view Metheg was employed.

The forms נִיחִי and נִיחִי accented with Pashta are perhaps to be classed with these forms, if they indeed form one class, inasmuch as they have Metheg in what is apparently a closed syllable preceding the tone. It may be, however, that these forms, in the melody indicated by Pashta, were to be read *uâ-îe-hî*, *uâ-îe-hî*.

In the second place the words זֶרַעְכֶם, זֶרַעְךָ take Metheg with the Pathah under ז; when the words have a disjunctive accent, viz., זֶרַעְכֶם, זֶרַעְךָ. It is not impossible that this Metheg was employed to call attention to the short vowel of the first syllable, and to prevent the pronunciation *zâ-ra-kha*; *-khem*, to which the combinations *zar-'a-kha*, *-khem* would tend to be reduced in order to obviate the difficulty occasioned by the occurrence of both ע and spirated כ in close proximity.

Examples of individual forms with peculiar Methegs are, e. g., קָלְתִּי (Job. 40, 4), יִפְגֹּשֶׁךָ (Gen. 32, 18), וּמִגְדָּלִים (2 Chr. 14, 6), יוֹצִיא רִיבִי (Prov. 30, 33). In קָלְתִּי the Metheg may have been placed under ל to indicate that the accent is not on the syllable marked with the prepositive accent, but on the second syllable. In יִפְגֹּשֶׁךָ the Metheg with ג marks the short *ô*; the Metheg in the first syllable is perhaps due to the irregular pronunciation of ג. Several of the imperfect forms of פָּנָה have a spirated ג, viz., יִפְגֹּשֶׁךָ and וְתִפְגֹּשֶׁךָ (1 Sam. 25, 20), doubtless following the analogy of the perfect where ג regularly has this pronunciation, viz., פָּגַשׁ &c. This pronunciation may have given rise to the Metheg in the first syllable just as the spirantic value of the third consonant may have done so in the forms like תְּרַבִּי explained above. In וּמִגְדָּלִים it is not impossible that the Metheg, by an extension of the use of the accentual Metheg to a closed syllable, may be intended to mark the second-

ary accent in the second syllable before the tone<sup>1</sup>. In יִצְיָא רִיב the Metheg is perhaps intended for the so-called euphonic Metheg (Baer III. A. b).

### Repetition of Metheg.

In a number of cases two or more Methegs occur in the same word or series of words connected by Maqqeph.

When two or more syllables precede a Metheg denoting the secondary tone, the first open syllable two or more places before the syllable with Metheg takes an additional Metheg to denote what might be called a tertiary accent; e. g., הָאֲשֵׁרִיאֵלִי (Num. 26, 31), וַמִּהְיוֹנוֹת (Ezek. 42, 5), וְאַבְרָהָה (Gen. 12, 3), וְהַקְמֵתִי (Gen. 9, 11), וְאַשְׁמְחֵהוּ (Gen. 24, 48), שְׁנֵי-בְנֵי-יַעֲקֹב (Gen. 34, 25), &c.

When one of the elements discussed under the second subdivision of the accentual Metheg (cf. above p. 87 f.) occurs two places or more before a Metheg denoting the secondary tone, it may take a second Metheg just as if the first Metheg denoted the primary accent, e. g., מִמִּסְכְּנֵי-וֹתֵיהֶם (Is. 55, 9), מִמִּסְכְּנֵי-וֹתֵיהֶם (Ps. 18, 46), &c. This Metheg denotes a tertiary accent as in the first case.

A Metheg which for any of the reasons already stated falls on a short vowel in a closed syllable may be retained immediately before a Metheg which precedes a Hateph, e. g., וַיַּעֲקֹר (Gen. 22, 9), בְּמַחֲוֶה (Gen. 15, 1), unless the Metheg stands with Holem, e. g., הַשְׁאֵבֶת (Gen. 24, 11) [cf. above p. 11].

Occasionally an open syllable preceding a syllable with Metheg before a Hateph also takes a Metheg for one of the reasons just stated, e. g., שְׁנֵאֲדָה (Ex. 23, 5, Mantua). In the form מִלְאֲתָהּ (Ex. 22, 28, Mantua) both second and third open syllable before the tone are marked by Metheg, indicating doubtless a combination of two traditions with regard to the place of the secondary tone.

The Metheg that marks a long or short vowel as such without regard to tone may stand before a Metheg which marks the secondary tone, e. g., הַקִּים-אֶתָּהּ (Deut. 29, 12), וְלִהְיֶתָּהּ (Deut. 26, 19), כָּל-עֵץ-מֵאֲכָל (Ezek. 47, 12), &c. When, however, a syllable containing such a Metheg is preceded by a syllable which should take the Metheg denoting the secondary tone,

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Brockelmann, *Grundriß*, p. 103, η, aa.



the accentual Metheg is omitted, e. g., עֲשֵׂר־יוֹם (Nu. 9, 3), וְלֹא־יָהִיָּה (Gen. 9, 15), &c. The non-accentual Metheg is here apparently treated as if it had accentual value, these cases following the analogy of instances like בִּרְמֶלֶזָה (Gen. 6, 13), where the Metheg, whatever it may have stood for originally, certainly marks the secondary tone.

Words ending in a final guttural and consisting of two closed syllables, which are joined by Maqqeph to a word with a disjunctive accent on the first syllable, may take an accentual Metheg with the vowel of the first syllable (cf. above p. 89), and a Metheg under the guttural (cf. above p. 82), e. g., נִקְחָ֑נוּ (Gen. 34, 16), נִשְׁבַּע־לִי (Gen. 24, 7), הִנֵּה־לִּי (Hos. 4, 17).

In בִּרְלֹא־כֵן (2 Sam. 23, 5) the Metheg may in both cases mark the long vowel before Maqqeph; the one with בִּי, however, may be accentual. For the two Methegs in יִפְגַּשֶׁךָ (Gen. 32, 18) cf. above p. 91.

Occasionally three Methegs are found in the same word, e. g., וּמִמֶּנֶּמְדָּךְ (Is. 22, 19, Mantua), בְּהִשְׁתַּחֲוִיָּהּ (2 Ki. 5, 8)<sup>2</sup>. Here the Metheg nearest the end of the word indicates the secondary tone according to rule, and the preceding complex of syllables takes two Methegs just as if the secondary tone were primary (cf. above p. 92).

### Confusion in the Use and Interpretation of Metheg.

The variety of uses to which the Metheg was put would naturally lead to a certain amount of inconsistency in its application to the text of the Old Testament, and also to a certain amount of confusion as to the meaning of the sign after its application, especially as this was not the work of one man working at one time, but of a large number working at different times and under various influences. Inconsistencies and misunderstandings, therefore, are to be expected, and in spite of the fact that the rules for its application were in all

<sup>1</sup> This pointing is given by Olshausen, *Lehrbuch*, p. 89. No Metheg is employed in either case in the Mantua edition, Van der Hooght., or Baer-Delitzsch.

<sup>2</sup> If this form is to be read הִשְׁתַּחֲוִיָּהּ (cf. Burney, *Notes on Hebr. text of the Book of Kings*, Oxford, 1903, pp. 208, 280; also Stade and Schwally *The Books of Kings* in SBOT ed. by Prof. Paul Haupt, Leipzig, 1904, p. 201), then the Metheg of the first syllable is like the first Metheg in forms like יִנְעֶקֶר above.

probability thoroughly worked over and systematized at a later period, some of these still remain.

From the fact that the Metheg was employed to call attention to both long and short vowels, it happens that it was used not only with a long Qames, but sometimes also with a Qames Hatuph (cf. above p. 83 f.). The Jewish grammarians, however, considered that every Qames marked with Metheg indicated an *â*, hence they read *אָרְהִי לִי*, *פָּעַלְהָ*, *פָּעַלְוּ*, &c., *pâ-'o-lô*, *pâ-'ol-khâ*, *'â-râ-lî*, *qâ-dâ-šîm*, &c., respectively<sup>1</sup>.

From the fact that it may stand in both open and closed syllables, it was sometimes doubtful as to which was the character of the syllable in which it stood when the vowel marked with Metheg was followed by a simple Shewa. Therefore it happens that a long vowel with Metheg before Shewa e. g., *הִיְתָה*, *יִזְעִי*, *יִדְעִי*, &c., is regularly considered by the Jewish grammarians as standing in a closed syllable<sup>2</sup>, viz., *hâi-thah*, &c., though it is more likely that the syllable is open and the Shewa vocal, viz., *hâ-î-ě-thah*, &c.<sup>3</sup> On the other hand certain cases in which we have a closed syllable with short vowel and Metheg followed by silent Shewa are considered by the Massorites as open syllables, the Shewa being therefore vocal, e. g., *יְהִיָּה* (Gen. 18, 18)<sup>4</sup> and *יְהִיָּה* (Lev. 7, 33)<sup>4</sup>, and certain of the forms mentioned on page 13 f., e. g., *תִּבְחַר* (Ps. 65, 5), *תִּלְעַג* (Prob. 30, 17), which are evidently to be read according to certain Massorites *îi-he-îeh*, *tî-he-îeh*, *tî-va-har*, *tî-la-ag*. The fact that, in a combination of forms like *יְהִיָּה*, *יְהִיָּה* with a preceding word by Maqqeph, no Metheg is used in the final open syllable of the first word, e. g., *לֹא־יְהִיָּה* (Gen. 9, 15), seems to indicate that the Metheg in the second word was considered an accentual Metheg. That the Massorites were not always certain as to whether the Metheg stood in an open or closed syllable when the vowel was short is shown by the form *אֲשֶׁנִּי*, which was marked with Metheg in the first syllable; viz., *אֲשֶׁנִּי*. Whatever may have been the original meaning of the Metheg here, it was considered as marking an open syllable by the Massorites, and a special Metheg was often placed after the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Gesenius-Kautzsch, *Hebräische Grammatik*, 28<sup>te</sup> Aufl., Leipzig, 1909, p. 52, v.

<sup>2</sup> Gesenius-Kautzsch, *op. cit.* p. 68, v.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. König, *Lehrgebäude* 1, pp. 111—118.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Baer, *op. cit.*, p. 65, ft. nt. 2.

Shewa to show without a doubt that the intended reading was 'a-še-rê and not 'aš-rê, as would be possible if the pointing were simply אֲשֶׁרִי.

Cases in which we have two accentual Methegs in adjacent syllables, the second usually standing before a H̄ateph vowel, are perhaps, as we have seen, due to a combination of two traditions as to the proper place for the Metheg (cf. pp. 92, 88).

### Use of H̄atephs after Metheg.

There seems to have been a tendency that was not completely carried out, to mark vocal Shewa after Metheg by a H̄ateph. This tendency seems to have originated from the close association of Metheg with a following H̄ateph in words where the H̄ateph stands under a guttural, where of course it is quite regular, as, e. g., in נֶעֱשֶׂה (Gen. 1, 26), בָּאֲרִית (Gen. 14, 10), אֶהְיֶה (Gen. 9, 21), צִחָקָה (Gen. 18, 13), צִעֲקִים (Gen. 4, 10), הָאֲמַת (Gen. 42, 16), &c. From such cases it was extended to forms in which the consonant following the Metheg was not a guttural, H̄ateph Pathah being employed except in the vicinity of an *u* or *o* vowel or of a labial consonant, when H̄ateph Qames is used; e. g., נִלְכָּה (Ex. 3, 18), וְלֶהְבִּדִּיל (Gen. 1, 18), וְהֵבֵב (Gen. 2, 12), לִקְחָהּ (Gen. 2, 24), וַיִּטֶּהָר (Job. 17, 9), שִׁמְעָה (Ps. 39, 13), וְנִלְלוּ (Gen. 29, 3), קָלְלָתָהּ (Gen. 27, 13). This use of H̄ateph we find extended by some authorities to cases in which the Shewa is certainly not vocal, e. g., יִצְחָק (Gen. 21, 6), הִתְמַלֵּךְ (Jer. 22, 15), אֲבִיחָר (Job. 29, 25), &c.

In the case of Shewa following non-guttural consonants, the H̄ateph is the rule according to some grammarians with a consonant which has lost the doubling preceded by Pathah, e. g., וְתִאֲלָצְהוּ (Jud. 16, 16), הִלְלוּ (Ps. 113, 1), &c., and also with a consonant after any vowel, when the same consonant is repeated immediately, e. g., סִבְרִים (Ps. 68, 7), קָלְלָתָהּ (Gen. 27, 13), &c. Here the use of the H̄ateph has been carried to greater lengths than elsewhere, though even in this case there are exceptions<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> These rules, though said to be rules of Ben Asher, are not supported by the evidence of the best manuscripts. Still they represent the ideas of certain of the grammarians, and as such are worthy of note: cf. Gesenius-Kautzsch *op. cit.* p. 55 foll., Ginsburg, *Introd.* p. 466; T. C. Foote, *Some Unwarranted Innovations in the text of the Hebrew Bible*, JHU. Circs. No. 163, June, 1903, p. 71f.

Baer's rule that Metheg always stands with a vowel which precedes a Hateph unless the consonant between them is doubled, results from the fact that in all cases except those in which the Hateph follows a guttural, the Hateph is due to the Metheg and not vice versa.

#### Relation between Metheg and Daghesh.

In a number of cases the Metheg seems to stand in some relation with Daghesh, particularly with the Daghesh which represents an accentual doubling, such as the Daghesh following the article. As both signs have a similar signification, both denoting an emphasis of some sort, a Daghesh does not usually follow Metheg, as in that case they would both emphasize the same vowel. The two signs are often mutually exclusive. This fact appears most clearly in the case of ה interrogative. Here when the ה is pointed with Pathah it regularly takes Metheg, e. g., הַמִּכְסָּה (Gen. 18, 17), &c. [cf. above p. 85 f.], but in a certain number of cases, chiefly with Shewa after the initial consonant of the word to which ה is prefixed, Daghesh stands in this consonant instead, e. g., הַכְּצַקְתָּהּ (Gen. 18, 21), הַיֵּיטֵב (Lev. 10, 19), הַשְּׁמָנָה (Nu. 13, 20), הַרְאִיתָם (1 Sam. 10, 24), &c. A similar relation between the Metheg and the Daghesh was perhaps felt also in the case of the article and ו conversive. Compare for example הַמִּכְסָּה (Lev. 3, 3), וַיִּשְׁלַחְהָ (Gen. 21, 14), with הַמְּקָרָה (Ecc. 10, 18), וַנְּשַׁלְּחֶהָ (Gen. 26, 29), &c.

We find Metheg instead of Daghesh also in some instances in which the Daghesh represents a real doubling. Compare, for examples, מִשְׁתִּים (Jon. 4, 11), הִלְלִי (Ps. 113, 1).

In a number of cases, however, in spite of this antithesis we find both Metheg and Daghesh together, e. g., cases like הַכְּנַעֲנִי (Gen. 10, 18), וַיִּשְׁמְעֵנִי (Gen. 3, 8), in which both Metheg and Daghesh emphasize the same thing, viz., that the vowel of the article or ו conversive has a secondary stress, and cases like אֲשַׁלְּחֶהָ (Gen. 32, 27), מְמַחֲרֶתָּ (Gen. 19, 34), יִקְמִיץֶנָּה (Gen. 4, 24), וַיִּתְּנֵהָ לִי (Gen. 23, 9), &c., in which the Daghesh indicated simply a doubled consonant and had no accentual meaning, and hence Metheg was affixed to the preceding vowel to indicate that it bore the secondary tone.

While it seems probably that this antithesis between Metheg and Daghesh was recognized, and made use of to a

certain extent, it was certainly never generally applied to the text of the Old Testament, doubtless because it served no special purpose. It is not impossible, however, that on this antithesis is based the use of the sign Raphe (cf. below p. 23).

### Relation between Metheg and the Musical Accents.

One of the most important points of difference, according to Baer, between the so-called light and heavy Metheg is that the light Metheg may be changed into certain conjunctive accents, e. g., **הָאֵלֹהִים** (Gen. 2, 19) instead of **הָאֵלֹהִים**, while the heavy Metheg is never supplanted in this way.

It is to be noted, however, that even when according to what appear to be the Massoretic rules, such change is possible, it is not by any means always made<sup>1</sup>. Moreover the Metheg in a closed syllable immediately before the tone which may become a conjunctive accent as in **בְּלִי-יָחִיו** (Is. 26, 14), **וְאֶת-בְּרָאיוֹ** (1 Chr. 28, 11), is certainly different from the ordinary accentual Metheg in an open syllable two or more places from the tone. So the fact that two Methesgs may be replaced by a conjunctive accent does not necessarily show that they are of the same character.

The fact that the so-called heavy Metheg is not ordinarily changed to a conjunctive accent may be due to the difference in the character of the forms in which it is found. In most cases it occurs in a closed syllable, while the so-called light Metheg ordinarily occurs in an open syllable.

That the so-called heavy Metheg may occasionally become a conjunctive accent is shown by such forms as, **לִירְעָה** (Gen. 24, 7) for **לִירְעָה**, **וַיִּשְׁמְעוּ** (Ezra 4, 1) for **וַיִּשְׁמְעוּ**, **אֶת-נִדְלָהּ** (Deut. 3, 24) for **אֶת-נִדְלָהּ**, &c., where the Metheg is replaced by the so-called Methiga<sup>2</sup>.

The difference between forms with Metheg and those with a conjunctive accent is probably one of a more or less musical recitation of the word; Metheg indicating simply a stress or emphasis of some kind, the conjunctive accent, a stress plus some musical modulation. It is not impossible that the reason

<sup>1</sup> Cf. W. Wickes, *A Treatise on the Accentuation of the . . . Prose Books of the O. T.*, Oxford, 1887, pp. 67, 73, 80, 81, 91, 97, 109, 110, 111; *A Treatise on the Accentuation of the . . . Poetical Books of the O. T.*, Oxford, 1881, pp. 57, 70, 86, 88.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Wickes, *Accent. of Prose Books*, pp. 81, 82.

the Metheg is replaced by the conjunctive accent, instead of standing together with it, is in the first instance a mechanical one, to avoid the heaping up of diacritical points, as almost all these conjunctive accents are placed below the consonant in the same position as Metheg. Compare for example הָאֶרֶם with Metheg, with הָאֶרֶם, הָאֶרֶם, הָאֶרֶם, הָאֶרֶם, הָאֶרֶם, with Munah, Merḥa, Mehuppakh, Mayela, and Azla respectively.

### Other Signs derived from Metheg.

Numerous as are the uses of the Metheg which have been enumerated, the category of its activities has not yet been exhausted. There are several other diacritical marks which are identical with Metheg in form and which seem to be simply extensions of the uses of Metheg proper. These diacritical marks are Silluq, Paseq<sup>1</sup>, and Raphe (?).

The fundamental use of Metheg, as we have seen, was to call special attention to something, and the things to which it ordinarily called the attention were three in number, viz., a consonant, a vowel (long or short), and an accent.

The Silluq, which calls attention to the strong emphasis that rests on the accented syllable of the final word in a verse, is probably simply an extension of the accentual Metheg.

The Paseq<sup>2</sup>, in one of its uses, is practically identical with the Metheg that emphasizes a final guttural to prevent its being slurred with the initial guttural of the following word, as, e. g., פָּתַח הָאֵהָל (Nu. 12, 5), יִבְכֶּה אִישׁ (Hos. 4, 4), שָׁלַח חֶשֶׁךְ (Ps. 105, 28), אֶרְבַּע-עָשָׂרָה (Gen. 31, 41), צִרְרָה רִיחַ (Hos. 4, 19) &c. The Paseq in question is called *paseq euphonicum*, and is used occasionally without any regularity between two words, one of which ends and the other begins with the same consonant, e. g., הָאֵל | לָנוּ (Ps. 68, 21), רָע | לְדָרָךְ (Ps. 141, 4), נָעַל | נֶן (Cant. 4, 12), &c. The chief differences between Metheg and Paseq in this case seem to be first that Metheg is used in the case of a guttural including ר, while Paseq is used with other consonants including ר; secondly that in the case of Metheg the two consonants are not necessarily identical, while in the case

<sup>1</sup> For the identity of Silluq and Paseq with Metheg in form cf. Wickes *Accent. of Poet. Books*, p. 95.

<sup>2</sup> For the best discussion of the uses of Paseq cf. Wickes *Accent. of Poet. Books*, pp. 95—98; *Accent. of Prose Books*, pp. 120—129.

of Paseq they are regularly so, though there is one instance in which this is not the case, the consonants however being both sibilants, viz., נָחַשׁ | שָׂרָף (Deut. 8, 15). These differences, it is plain, are merely formal, perhaps accidental, and not differences in principle. It is not improbable that the Paseq originated from the Metheg used with consonants, which for some reason, perhaps by accident, was placed after the word instead of under the final consonant.

The chief use of the so-called ordinary Paseq, however, seems to be to call special attention to the word after which it was placed, e. g., יְהוָה | וְיִמְלֹךְ (Ex. 15, 18), הָיוּ נֶתָן | וְיָמֹת (1 Sam. 14, 45), עַל־הָדָם | תֹּאכְלוּ (Ezek. 33, 25), לֹא יִשְׁמַע | אֲדָנִי (Ps. 66, 18). This is evidently an extension of the same general principle which lies at the basis of the use of Metheg.

From its position between two words or perhaps more especially because it was employed to prevent two identical consonants from being slurred together, Paseq came naturally to be used as a sign of separation. This is the principle at the basis of the *paseq distinctivum*, e. g., וַיֹּאמֶר | לֹא (Gen. 18, 15), which is marked with Paseq to denote that the two words are to be separated and not closely connected as in the identically sounding combination וַיֹּאמֶר לוֹ תְּרַפָּה; וַיֹּאמֶר לוֹ (Jos. 15, 25), where the two words are to be treated as distinct names, &c. It also lies at the basis of *paseq homonymicum*, which is employed occasionally between two identical or similar words, e. g., אֲבָרְהָם | אֲבָרְהָם (Gen. 22, 11), אָמֵן | אָמֵן (Nu. 5, 22), הַמּוֹל | הַמּוֹל (Gen. 17, 13), הַשֹּׁמֵעַ | הַשֹּׁמֵעַ (Ezek. 3, 27). Here also belongs what is called *paseq euphemisticum*, which separates the divine name from a word with which it seemed improper to associate it, e. g., אֱלֹהִים | אָדָם (Deut. 4, 32), אֱלֹהִים | רָעָה (1 Sam. 18, 10), אֱלֹהִים | שָׁטָן (1 Ki. 11, 14), רָשָׁע | אֱלֹהִים (Ps. 10, 13).

Finally the Paseq implying separation was made a part of the system of musical accents. It was employed in some cases as a disjunctive accent to mark the dichotomy in clauses governed by certain of the minor disjunctive accents, though the principles that govern its application are the same as in the case of the ordinary Paseq; we have namely *paseq distinctivum*, *emphaticum*, *homonymicum*, *euphonicum*, *euphemisticum*.

Besides being employed as an independent disjunctive accent, Paseq is employed to transform a conjunctive into a disjunctive accent. In the prose books, when joined to Munah, it forms

Legarmeh or Munah Legarmeh. In the poetical books, from Shalshleth, Azla, and Mehuppah it forms Great Shalshleth, Azla Legarmeh, and Mehuppah Legarmeh. In the case of the prose accent Shalshleth, the Paseq is added to an already disjunctive accent for the sake of conformity with the pausal Shalshleth of the poetical books<sup>1</sup>.

The upright line to the left of the two perpendicular dots in Zaqeph Gadol (") is possibly nothing but Paseq, which true to its emphatic nature indicates a fuller, stronger melody than Zaqeph Qaton with the two perpendicular dots alone<sup>2</sup>.

The Raphe, which is a straight mark similar to Metheg, only horizontal instead of perpendicular, is possibly also simply Metheg in its origin. It has been shown that the antithesis of Metheg and Daghesht was probably recognized by the Massorites, but that only an exceptional use was made of this principle (cf. above p. 19). It is not impossible that the inventors of the system of pointing, in casting about for a sign to mark the absence of Daghesht, selected the Metheg for this use on account of its recognized antithesis to Daghesht. To place the Metheg either before or after the consonant in which the absence of Daghesht was to be noted would have led to great ambiguity, as Metheg in this position already had a well defined positive signification, so it was placed above the consonant in question, and here, probably for reasons of convenience, it was written in a horizontal position.

### Conclusion.

The results of the preceding discussion may be briefly summed up as follows. In general the traditional classification of the uses of Metheg as set forth by Baer, has been rejected and new principles of division set up. An attempt has been made to reduce all of the uses of Metheg to the same fundamental principle; to show what the relation between Metheg and certain diacritical marks is; and finally to prove that certain of these marks are simply extensions of Metheg.

Three chief uses of the Metheg are to be distinguished, viz.,

---

<sup>1</sup> So Wickes, *Accent. of Prose Books*, p. 121.

<sup>2</sup> Wickes thinks this is a doubled accent mark like Gershaim ("), Merkha Kephula (⌒), or Pazer Gadol (°), the sign " standing for "; cf. *Accent. of Prose Books*; p. 18.



that which calls special attention to a consonant, that which calls special attention to a vowel long or short, and that which marks a secondary or tertiary accent, the accentual Metheg.

The historical development of these uses is perhaps to be conceived of as follows. At first the sign was a *nota bene* attached to a consonant or a vowel. From the fact that the Metheg was often affixed to a vowel which bore the secondary accent, the sign acquired an accentual meaning, and was employed to mark the secondary tone, regularly in an open syllable, as it was in such syllables that the accentual use originated, and also to some extent in closed syllables. The most important and most common use of the Metheg, viz., the accentual use, would therefore not be the most original use of the sign. An extension of its accentual use was to mark an accent falling on a Shewa as the result of the musical recitation of the text. A further extension of the accentual Metheg is the use of the sign as Silluq to mark the tone syllable of the final word in a verse. The Paseq seems to be derived from the Metheg, being most commonly employed to call special attention not to a single sound or accent, but to a whole word. It originated perhaps from the Metheg affixed to consonants. Its uses as a sign of separation, and as an element of the system of musical accents are secondary. Finally from an accidental opposition between Metheg and Daghesb, the Metheg comes to be used in a changed position as Raphe to mark the absence of Daghesb.

As the result of the varying uses of Metheg a certain amount of confusion arises in the application of the sign, and its uses have for the most part never been carried out to their logical conclusion. This is particularly true of its minor uses, such as for example its use to specially mark out a vowel, but it is also the case even in its most important and most common use, as the sign of the secondary accent. Here it is practically confined to open syllables for the reason stated above, though in a number of cases it is for special reasons extended to closed syllables.

The same thing is true of the Paseq, the cases in which it is omitted, when it might be applied according to rule, are much more numerous than the cases in which it occurs.

From the fact that Metheg was very frequently used before a Hataep in words containing a guttural has arisen a tendency

to use a H̄ateph in place of a simple Shewa after all Methegs, but here again the tendency after some development became abortive.

Metheg has come, probably through accident, to be regarded to some extent as the antithesis of Daghesh, hence the development of Raphe from Metheg.

The fact that a conjunctive accent is at times substituted for Metheg, does not necessarily show anything with regard to the value of the Metheg, it is simply the substitution of a sign denoting melody for a *nota bene* or accentual sign. The fact that Metheg is not retained in addition to the musical accent is perhaps due to the fact that in the great majority of cases the proper position of both was to the left of the vowel of the syllable to which they appertained, and so the less important sign was omitted.

Metheg has never been regarded as a sign which has everywhere the same meaning, but there has always been a tendency among grammarians to exaggerate the importance of the accentual Metheg which marks the secondary tone and hence an open syllable, at the expense of the less prominent varieties, and to ascribe to this Metheg cases which really belong elsewhere. Enough has been said, however, to show that in no case can the meaning of Metheg be considered as fixed *a priori*, it does not necessarily mark a long vowel, or an open syllable, nor is the Shewa that follows it necessarily vocal, its significance will depend on the character of the form in which it occurs.

Nevertheless in spite of this fact, Metheg taken in connection with the other pointing, and our knowledge of the forms derived from other sources, furnishes very useful evidence with regard to the traditional pronunciation of Hebrew, and is therefore quite worthy of the attention of those who make a study of Hebrew grammar.

Metheg is not the only sign, the conception of which is in need of revision; the last word has by no means been said as to the significance of a number of the marks used by the Massorites. A thoroughgoing investigation of the principles, fundamental and derived, of these marks would, I think, reduce to much smaller proportions the residuum of unexplained forms in the text of the Hebrew Bible.